

Appin No. 09/608,022
Amdt. Dated February 11, 2004
Reply to Office action of December 1, 2003

10

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112

The Applicant proposes to amend claims 29-30, 36-46 and 48 from a system to refer to an apparatus. This change has been recommended by the Examiner.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

The Examiner has rejected the remaining claims on the basis of Patterson (US Patent 5,797,002) in view of Mossberg (US Patent 5,803,500).

The current application has been developed to allow a large number of distributed users to interact with networked information via printed matter and optical sensors, thereby to obtain interactive printed matter on demand via high speed networked color printers in order to effect an auction buyer to submit a bid.

The invention as claimed provides the auction buyer with a printed form containing information relating to a bid transaction. The form has coded data indicative of an identity of the form and of at least one reference point of the form. A computer system receives indicating data from a sensing device regarding the identity of the form and a position of the sensing device relative to the form. This occurs when the sensing device is placed in an operative position relative to the form that senses the indicating data using at least some of the coded data. The computer system then identifies from the indicating data at least one parameter relating to the bid transaction.

Patterson on the other hand discloses a data structure for use in a two-way wireless system for processing equity trades and the like as part of this system order entry forms are able to be called up on a computer. That is, the order entry forms are in electronic format and are not printed. A user then uses a keyboard or touch screen in order to fill the form out. The form is then sent electronically for the order to be filled.

This document does not appear to disclose a printed form as the form is located on a computer screen. Therefore it is difficult to see how the form includes coded data indicative of an identity of the form and of at least one reference point of the form. Further, there does not appear to be a sensing device that produces indicating data regarding the identity of the form and a position of the sensing device relative to the form when the sensing device is placed in an operative position relative to the form. If the sensing device is the touch screen then there does not appear to be a correlation between the sensing device and the touch screen regarding the identity of the form. Also, it appears that the touch screen will also be located in the same operative position relative to form. Hence it appears impossible that there is a sensing device that produces indicating data using some of the coded data.

The Applicant submits that clearly the system disclosed in Patterson is in fact entirely different to the method and apparatus as claimed in claims 1 and 29.

Appln No. 09/608,022
Amdt. Dated February 11, 2004
Reply to Office action of December 1, 2003

11

The above application provides distinct advantages over and above Patterson in that a printed form is used as opposed to an electronic form. Further, the sensing device is used to produce indicating data using some of the coded data located on the printed form. This is a new invention and Patterson in view of Mossberg does not show this new technology. The Applicant submits that as the outstanding issues of the official action have been addressed, the application should now proceed to allowance.

Very respectfully,

Applicants:



PAUL LAPSTUN



JACQUELINE ANNE LAPSTUN



C/o: KIA SILVERBROOK
Email: kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com
Telephone: +612 9818 6633
Facsimile: +61 2 9818 6711